



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.11.102](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.11.102)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Echeverri Restrepo, S., Di Stefano, D., Mrovec, M., & Paxton, A. T. (2019). Density functional theory calculations of iron - vanadium carbide interfaces and the effect of hydrogen. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HYDROGEN ENERGY*, 45(3), 2382-2389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.11.102>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Density functional theory calculations of iron - vanadium carbide interfaces and the effect of hydrogen

Sebastián Echeverri Restrepo^{a,b,*}, Davide Di Stefano^c, Matous Mrovec^d, Anthony T. Paxton^b

^aSKF Research & Technology Development (RTD), SKF B.V., Meidoornkade 14, 3992 AE, Houten, The Netherlands

^bDepartment of Physics, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom

^cANSYS Granta, Rustat House, 62 Clifton Road Cambridge, CB1 7EG, United Kingdom

^dICAMS, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

Abstract

According to recent experimental research, vanadium-carbide precipitates can improve hydrogen resistance and hardness in steels. In the present article, density functional theory calculations are performed to study the structure and energetics of iron–vanadium carbide interfaces and how hydrogen interacts with them. A comparison of the solubility of hydrogen in different sites shows that hydrogen will tend to segregate towards the iron–vanadium carbide interface and that carbon vacancies within a vanadium carbide precipitate behave as strong hydrogen traps. Additionally, it is shown that the presence of hydrogen at an iron–vanadium carbide interface does not cause a significant embrittlement of the material.

Keywords: Hydrogen embrittlement, Interfaces, Density functional theory, Vanadium carbides

Introduction

Bearing steels need to cope with severe cyclic and static loads, especially those generated by rolling contact fatigue. Usually the type of steels that better comply with all these requirements are those that are hardened via heat treatments to contain a martensitic or bainitic structure. They must also have high hardness, strength and toughness and, due to the varying working environmental conditions, they need to be resistant to corrosion and to the effects of hydrogen (H) [1].

In the case of bearing applications, H can penetrate the steel due to the decomposition of the lubricant, the presence of water in the lubricant, fretting and/or other corrosion reactions. There is ample evidence that support the fact that the presence of H in bearing steels leads to a degradation of its mechanical properties, including the resistance to fatigue regardless of the mode of loading [1–4].

Although there have been several mechanisms proposed to explain the way that H causes embrittlement on steels [5], in the case of bearings subjected to rolling contact fatigue, recent work presents strong evidence that H accelerates damage via the formation of white etching areas with associated cracks [6]. This supports the hypothesis that H-enhanced localised plasticity [7] is the principal H embrittlement mechanism in bearing steels [6].

The presence of transition metal carbides and nitrides can affect the distribution of H in the steel matrix as

well as hydrogen diffusivity. It has been suggested that these particles may efficiently trap H and thus lower the steel's susceptibility to H embrittlement. For instance, a tailored precipitation of vanadium carbide (VC) particles was demonstrated to reduce the damage due to H embrittlement [8].

In the present work, H trapping at the interfaces between VC and Body-Centred-Cubic (BCC) Fe matrix using first-principles calculations based on Density Functional Theory (DFT) [9, 10] is investigated. The aim is to determine whether these interfaces can act as efficient traps for the immobilisation of H, as has been seen in experiments [11–13] and in the TiC-Fe system [14]. Additionally, we calculate the solubility of H at the VC-Fe interface considering C-vacancies and we estimate the effect of segregated H on the cohesive strength of the interfaces via the theoretical work of separation.

The present article is divided into four parts. In the first part, the computational details are summarised; in the second part, the properties of individual phases are presented; in the third part, the structure and energetics of the clean interface is investigated; finally, in the fourth part, the behaviour of hydrogen at the interface is studied.

1. Computational details

1.1. General simulation parameters

All calculations were performed by means of density functional theory simulations [9, 10] using the ABINIT code [15]. A Generalised Gradient Approximation (GGA) [16–19] in the form given by Perdew, Burke and Ernzerhof [20] was employed for the exchange-correlation

*Corresponding author

Email address: sebastianecheverri@gmail.com (Sebastián Echeverri Restrepo)

and projector augmented wave (PAW) potentials [21–23] were used to describe the core electrons. For all the systems, total energy convergence tests in terms of the \mathbf{k} -points, number of bands, temperature of smearing and cut-off energy were performed using a convergence limit of $4 \times 10^{-5} E_h/\text{atom}$, where E_h is the Hartree energy. For the supercells with and without H, both ionic positions and cell vectors were relaxed using $5 \times 10^{-5} E_h a_0^{-1}$ as convergence limit of the forces for structural optimisations, where $a_0=0.529 \text{ \AA}$ is the Bohr radius. All calculations were carried out as spin-polarised. Additional computational details, relative to each specific systems, can be found in Table 1.

2. Individual phases

In order to be able to investigate the Fe-VC interface as well as the interaction with H, the fundamental properties of individual elemental phases were computed. The investigated systems are summarised in Table 1 together with the computational details used for the calculations.

For H_2 , two H atoms were inserted in a cubic box of dimensions $13 \times 13 \times 13 a_0$. Since the system contains only a single H_2 molecule placed in a large simulation cell, only one \mathbf{k} -point was used. After structural relaxation, the equilibrium interatomic distance for the H_2 molecule of $1.434 a_0$ was obtained, in agreement with other values reported in the literature [24].

The structure of VC belongs to the space group $Fm\bar{3}m$, No. 225. The calculation of its lattice parameter is carried out using the primitive unit cell containing 1 V and 1 C atoms. A simultaneous structural minimisation of the cell geometry and the position of the atoms using the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno minimisation (BFGS) as implemented in the software ABINIT was used to obtain the equilibrium structure. A lattice parameter of 4.155 \AA was found, consistent with other experimental and theoretical values available in the literature (see Table 2).

A similar procedure was followed for BCC V using a cell containing one single atom (space group $Im\bar{3}m$, No. 229) and for C in its graphite structure (space group $P6_3mc$, No. 186). The calculated lattice parameters for V and C are 2.996 \AA and 2.468 \AA , 8.704 \AA , respectively.

For Fe (ferrite), a cubic cell containing 16 atoms organised in a BCC structure was generated; this larger supercell was necessary for accurate determination of the H dissolution energy (see below). A structural minimisation of the system resulted in an equilibrium lattice parameter of 2.836 \AA , consistent with other values found in the literature (see Table 2). In the case of other simulations of Fe containing H, the same simulation parameters were used as the ones shown in Table 1.

3. The pristine interface

3.1. Structure

The studied interface is formed between Fe(100) and VC(100) crystals in the so called Baker-Nutting orientation relationship, which is frequently observed experimentally for carbide precipitates with a $B1$ crystal structure (rocksalt) embedded in a ferrite matrix (α) [2, 11, 46–48]. This misorientation is expressed as

$$(100)_\alpha \parallel (100)_{\text{VC}} \quad [010]_\alpha \parallel [011]_{\text{VC}} \quad (1)$$

In this orientation relationship the different lattice parameters of the two phases lead to a lattice mismatch which, for precipitates larger than about 10 nm, is accommodated by misfit dislocations. Moreover experimental observations suggest that it is possible to have a predominantly coherent interface [8, 13]. For these reasons only coherent interfaces were considered.

Additional to the relative misorientation of the grains, which define the five macroscopic degrees of freedom (DoFs) [49–51], three other microscopic DoFs that represent relative rigid translations of the grains need to be defined. In order to find the most stable interface, different possible rigid translations were tried. The most stable configuration results to be that with the Fe atoms positioned right on top of the C atoms.

The atomic structure of the investigated interface is shown in Figure 1. The supercell contains of 5 Fe, and 5 VC atomic layers; previous studies have shown that a system of such size is sufficiently large for the accurate calculation of the interfacial energy and of the dissolution energy of H at a coherent interface [14, 42, 52]




Figure 1: Front and side view of the interface between Fe and VC. The system is composed of 20 Fe, 20 V and 20 C atoms, drawn in orange, grey and black, respectively.

After the generation of the interface, a simultaneous structural minimisation of the cell geometry and the position of the atoms was carried out. The resulting dimensions of the system along the plane of the interface per unit cell are $2.925 \text{ \AA} \times 2.925 \text{ \AA}$ (for comparison, in references [53] and [54] values of 2.909 \AA and of 2.949 \AA were

Table 1: Calculation details for the DFT calculations performed. The units for the smearing temperature and the cut-off energy are E_h

Calculation details					
	k-point grid	k-points	Bands	Smearing temperature	Cut-off energy
H ₂		1	2	0.0015	14
V	18×18×18	190	12	0.001	36
C	19×19×19	400	32	0.001	36
Fe	6×6×6	108	1156	0.0005	46
VC	9×9×9	85	15	0.001	36
Fe _{surface}	6×6×2	36	450	0.0009	37
VC _{surface}	6×6×2	36	450	0.0009	37
Fe-VC _{interface}	6×6×2	36	450	0.0009	37

Table 2: Calculated values of the lattice parameters for VC, V, C and Fe. Theoretical and experimental values from literature are presented for comparison when available. The units are [Å].

Lattice Parameters				
	Present work	Theory	Experiment	
VC	4.155	4.155 [25]; 4.174 [26]; 4.107 [26]; 4.156 [27] 4.164 [30]; 4.161 [31]; 4.160 [32]; 4.138 [29] 4.136 [33]; 4.095 [34]; 4.162 [34]; 4.129 [34]	4.163 [28]; 4.169 [29]	
V	2.996	3.032 [35]; 2.990 [35]; 2.988 [35]; 2.926 [35] 2.999 [37]	3.0399 [36]	
C	2.468, 8.704	2.461, ~9 [38]; 2.441, 6.664 [38]; 2.45, 6.6 [39] 2.47, >>7.5 [39]; 2.47, 7.0 [39]	2.456, 6.672 [40]	
Fe	2.836	2.833 [41]; 2.831 [42]; 2.835 [42] ; 2.767 [43] 2.869 [43]	2.853 [41]; 2.858 [44]; 2.855 [44]; 2.866 [45]	

found, respectively). This represents an expansion of the lattice parameter of Fe of 3% and a contraction of 0.5% for VC. As expected, the elastically softer Fe phase expands to match the lattice parameter of VC. All the calculations of the Fe-VC interface, including those containing H and/or C vacancies, were done using the parameters shown in Table 1.

The calculation of the free surfaces is conducted in a similar way, taking as a reference the system containing the interface. The size of the system is defined based on previous studies available in the literature where it has been shown that, for similar systems, the surface energy converges to within 0.05 J m^{-2} for slabs with 5 or more layers of atoms [55].

In the case of VC, the Fe atoms are removed leaving a slab of 5 VC atom layers with two free surfaces. The dimensions of the simulation box along the interface plane and the atom positions are then modified in such a way that the previously calculated equilibrium bulk lattice parameter is respected. The size of the box perpendicular to the interface is not changed. The same procedure is adopted for the generation of the Fe surface.

As already mentioned for the Fe-VC interface, all the calculations of the Fe and VC slabs, including those containing H, were done using the parameters shown in Table 1

3.2. Energetics

3.2.1. Formation enthalpy

The formation enthalpy of VC, $H_f [\text{VC}]$, is calculated as the energy difference between the total energy of bulk VC and the sum of that of its composing elements [46, 56, 57]:

$$H_f [\text{V}_y\text{C}_x] = \frac{E [\text{V}_y\text{C}_x] - yE [\text{V}] - xE [\text{C}]}{y + x} \quad (2)$$

where $E [\text{V}_y\text{C}_x]$ is the total energy of V_yC_x , and $E [\text{V}]$ and $E [\text{C}]$ are the total energies per atom of bulk V and C, respectively. In the present work, a value of $H_f [\text{VC}] = -0.435 \text{ eV/atom}$ was obtained, which is consistent with other theoretical values available in the literature [57–60]. The negative value indicates that the formation of bulk VC is energetically favourable with respect to the pure elements. Note that at zero pressure and temperature the total energy and enthalpy are equivalent.

3.2.2. Surface energies

In the case of the VC and Fe surfaces, the surface energies [61] were calculated using two different methods [62]: the first one (unrelaxed) consists in calculating the total energy of the system while keeping the atoms fixed in their ideal bulk positions; the second one (relaxed), allows the atoms to move—except for the atoms in the centre of the slab—in order to find their most energetically favourable positions. The dimensions of the simulation box are kept

Table 3: Calculated values of the surface energy for Fe (100) and VC (100).

	$\gamma_{\text{surf}} [\text{J m}^{-2}]$	
	Present work	Literature
Fe-Relaxed	2.49	2.25 [64]; 2.29 [63]
Fe-Unrelaxed	2.51	2.26 [64]; 2.32 [63]
VC-Relaxed	1.25	1.27 [55]
VC-Unrelaxed	1.63	

fixed in both cases. The relation used for the calculation of the surface energy of Fe, $\gamma_{\text{Fe-surf}}$ is [63]

$$\gamma_{\text{Fe-surf}} = \frac{E_{\text{Fe-slab}}^N - NE_{\text{Fe-bulk}}}{2A_{\text{Fe-slab}}} \quad (3)$$

where $E_{\text{Fe-slab}}^N$ is the total energy of a slab of N Fe atoms, $E_{\text{Fe-bulk}}$ the total energy of an Fe atom in the bulk, and $A_{\text{Fe-slab}}$ is the area of the surface. For the surface energy of VC, $\gamma_{\text{VC-surf}}$, the following equation is used:

$$\gamma_{\text{VC-surf}} = \frac{E_{\text{VC-slab}}^N - NE_{\text{VC-bulk}}}{2A_{\text{VC-slab}}} \quad (4)$$

where $E_{\text{VC-slab}}^N$ is the total energy of a slab containing N VC atom pairs, $E_{\text{VC-bulk}}$ is the total energy per VC atom pair of the material in the bulk and $A_{\text{VC-slab}}$ is the area of the surface.

The calculated surface energies for the relaxed and unrelaxed cases of VC and Fe are presented in Table 3. The results show that the relaxed surface energies are lower than those for the unrelaxed surfaces. In both cases a good agreement was found with other reported data [55, 63, 64].

3.2.3. Interfacial energy

The energy of the interface is calculated using the following equation [53]:

$$\gamma_{\text{Fe-VC}} = \frac{E_{\text{Fe-VC}} - nE_{\text{Fe-bulk}} - mE_{\text{VC-bulk}}}{2A_{\text{Fe-VC}}} \quad (5)$$

where $E_{\text{Fe-VC}}$ is the total energy of the interface system, $E_{\text{Fe-bulk}}$ the total energy per Fe atom in the bulk, $E_{\text{VC-bulk}}$ is the total energy per VC atom pair in the bulk, m (n) is the number of Fe atoms (VC atom pairs) in the interface system and $A_{\text{Fe-VC}}$ is the area of the interface.

For the interface under consideration the interface energy ($\gamma_{\text{Fe-VC}}$) is -0.090 J m^{-2} , comparable to the values of -0.076 J m^{-2} and -0.120 J m^{-2} found in the literature [42, 54]. The negative value indicates that there is a relatively strong bonding between VC and Fe, and that the formation of the interface is energetically favourable compared to the two separate bulk states [42, 53].

4. H interaction with the interface

4.1. Solubility

The solubility of H in a given system can be characterised by the dissolution energy ΔE_S , which is defined as [65, 66]:

$$\Delta E_S = E_{\text{System}+\text{H}} - E_{\text{System}} - \frac{E[\text{H}_2]}{2} \quad (6)$$

where E_{System} is the total energy of a given system, $E_{\text{System}+\text{H}}$ is the total energy of the same system but containing one interstitial H atom, and $E[\text{H}_2]$ is the energy of an H_2 molecule in vacuum.

Calculations of the dissolution energy were performed first for H present in the octahedral and tetrahedral position of a Fe cubic supercell containing 16 atoms. Calculations were also done for H in two different positions in the Fe-VC interface plane, corresponding to sites with similar symmetry to the octahedral and tetrahedral sites in Fe bulk, but with one of the vertices substituted with a V atom (see Figure 2). In all cases, a structural relaxation of the atomic positions and of the lattice vectors is carried out. The resulting dissolution energies are presented in Table 4.




Figure 2: Detail of the octahedral (left) and tetrahedral (right) positions of H in the Fe-VC interface. Fe is drawn in orange, V in grey, C in black and H in white.

In the case of bcc Fe, the calculated dissolution energies are consistent with those from other calculations, see Table 4. The dissolution energy for the tetrahedral site is lower than that for the octahedral site, meaning that H atoms will have the tendency to occupy the tetrahedral site. Indirect experimental evidence also favours tetrahedral occupancy [67].

A similar trend is found when comparing the octahedral and tetrahedral sites in the interface. The lower energy of the tetrahedral site shows that H will preferably segregate towards this site. Also, the lower dissolution energies of H at the interface indicate that the interfacial regions are more favourable for H than the bulk interstitial sites, and that it will have the tendency to segregate towards the interface.

In addition to the perfect interfaces, the segregation of H at C vacancies in the vicinity of the interface was also investigated. Two configurations were considered: in the first one, a C atom from the interface plane was removed;

Table 4: Dissolution energies (ΔE_S) for a single hydrogen particle in different systems. The calculation of the dissolution energy is performed using Equation 6.

	Dissolution energy [eV]	
	Present work	Literature
Fe _{Octahedral}	0.303	0.32 [66]; 0.34 [69] 0.36 [70]; 0.36 [71]
Fe _{Tetrahedral}	0.173	0.16 [14]; 0.19 [71] 0.20 [66]; 0.22 [70] 0.25 [65]
Fe-VC _{Octahedral}	0.097	
Fe-VC _{Tetrahedral}	0.067	
Fe-VC _{C-Vacancy-interface}	-0.382	
Fe-VC _{C-Vacancy-bulk}	-0.410	

in the second one, the second closest C atom from the interface was removed (which will be referred to as vacancy in bulk VC). It was found that these two configurations have the lowest dissolution energies among the analysed sites, making them the strongest trapping sites for H (see Table 4).

We compare our results with similar calculations from the literature but for a system containing an interface between Fe and TiC [14] (instead of VC). We see that, qualitatively, the trends are the same: the deepest trap for a H atom is a C vacancy in the bulk of the precipitate, followed by a vacancy at the interface. This is consistent with experimental findings that substoichiometric TiC allows the insertion of atomic H [68]. Similar to our results with VC, they also conclude that, at the interface, the tetrahedral position is more stable than the octahedral one.

4.2. Trap escape energy

Recent characterisation work [13] of a vanadium-carbide precipitation-steel using Atom Probe Tomography (APT) and hydrogen Thermal Desorption Spectroscopy (TDS) analysis found that there are two possible types of H traps resulting from the presence of VC precipitates in steels. The deeper trapping energy was estimated to be $59.6 \pm 10.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ($0.618 \pm 0.100 \text{ eV}$) and was attributed to the interface carbon vacancy. The shallower trapping energy was estimated to be $24.8 \pm 5.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ($0.257 \pm 0.050 \text{ eV}$) but its origin could not be clearly determined. And independent analysis of the same experiments using the generalised Kissinger equation gives values of $42.6 \pm 0.7 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ($0.442 \pm 0.007 \text{ eV}$) for the deep traps and of $23.5 \pm 1.2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ($0.244 \pm 0.012 \text{ eV}$) for the shallow ones [72].

To compare our results with the experiments, we follow the method proposed in [14]. We calculate the trap escape energy (ΔE_E), which is the energy needed for H to escape

from a given trap to bulk Fe:

$$\Delta E_E = -(\Delta E_S - \Delta E_S[\text{Fe}_{\text{Tetrahedral}}]) + \Delta E_{\text{mig}} \quad (7)$$

where ΔE_{mig} is the energy barrier for H migration in Fe and is considered to be equal to its bulk value of 0.09 eV [73]. Note that this equation is valid for H at the interface or in a C vacancy at the interface, but not for H trapped in a vacancy in bulk. For the latter case, it would be necessary to include the segregation and migration energies of H in bulk VC.

We calculate the trap escape energy for H in a C vacancy at the interface ($\Delta E_E[\text{Fe-VC}_{\text{C-Vacancy-interface}}]$) and in the tetrahedral position at the perfect interface ($\Delta E_E[\text{Fe-VC}_{\text{Tetrahedral}}]$). We obtain values of 0.645 eV and 0.196 eV, respectively.

The calculated value of $\Delta E_E[\text{Fe-VC}_{\text{C-Vacancy-interface}}]$ agrees with the experimentally measured deeper trapping energy (0.645 eV vs 0.618 ± 0.100 eV), which was also attributed to the the interface carbon vacancy [13].

Our calculated value of $\Delta E_E[\text{Fe-VC}_{\text{Tetrahedral}}]$ is akin to the shallower trap that was found experimentally (0.196 eV vs 0.257 ± 0.050 eV). This leads us to suggest that the shallower trap, whose origin is still debated in the literature, comes from the H trapped at the coherent boundary.

4.3. Crack formation

In order to check if the presence of H in the interface facilitates the formation of a crack along it –and, thus, the embrittlement of the material–, the work of separation [74, 75] of the interface with and without H are considered. The work of separation can be interpreted as the excess energy needed for the separation of the two grains along the interface and it corresponds to the energy difference between the fractured surfaces and the interface. In this sense, a change in the work of separation represents a change in the brittleness of the interface. Here it is important to note that, especially in ductile materials, the mechanical work needed to separate an interface can be larger than its work of separation [76].

In the case of the pristine Fe-VC interface, the work of separation $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Fe-VC}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{Fe-VC}} = \gamma_{\text{VC-surf}} + \gamma_{\text{Fe-surf}} - \gamma_{\text{Fe-VC}} \quad (8)$$

where $\gamma_{\text{VC-surf}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{Fe-surf}}$ are the surface energies of VC and Fe respectively and $\gamma_{\text{Fe-VC}}$ is the energy of a VC-Fe interface.

In the case of the H containing interface, the system with the H atom in the tetrahedral site is considered (see Figure 2) due to its lower dissolution energy. For the behaviour of H after the separation of the interface, two cases are considered: in the first one, it is assumed that after fracture the H atom stays attached to the Fe surface (after relaxation the H atom moves from the tetrahedral to the more

energetically stable octahedral position on the surface). In this case the work of separation is given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{(\text{Fe+H})\text{-VC}} = \gamma_{\text{VC-surf}} + \gamma_{\text{Fe-surf+H}} - \gamma_{\text{Fe-VC+H}} \quad (9)$$

where, $\gamma_{\text{Fe-surf+H}}$ is the energy of a Fe slab with an H atom on the surface and $\gamma_{\text{Fe-VC-H}}$ is the energy of a VC-Fe interface with an H atom in the tetrahedral position.

In the second case, it is assumed that once the two free surfaces are formed, H detaches from the Fe surface. The work of separation $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Fe-VC-H}}$ is then given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{Fe-VC-H}} = \gamma_{\text{VC-surf}} + \gamma_{\text{Fe-surf}} + \frac{E[\text{H}_2]}{2A_{\text{Fe-VC}}} - \gamma_{\text{Fe-VC+H}} \quad (10)$$

where $E[\text{H}_2]$ is the energy of an H_2 molecule in vacuum and $A_{\text{Fe-VC}}$ is the area of the interface.

The resultant values of the work of separation are 3.83 J m^{-2} , 3.93 J m^{-2} and 3.74 J m^{-2} for $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Fe-VC}}$, $\mathcal{W}_{(\text{Fe+H})\text{-VC}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Fe-VC-H}}$, respectively. Note that although in the case of $\mathcal{W}_{(\text{Fe+H})\text{-VC}}$ there is a slight decrease in the work of separation, even with the most pessimistic assumption its reduction is around 2%; this value is negligible considering the high concentration of H that was used in the calculations.

5. Conclusions

In the present work, a density functional theory study of H interaction with perfect and defective (100)Fe/(100)VC interfaces was carried out. The calculations show that the perfect coherent interface traps H only weakly, but much stronger trapping can be expected at C vacancies, both at the interface and in VC bulk. Thermodynamic estimates based on the work of separation show a negligible influence of H on the interface strength but more elaborate treatment is necessary for a more reliable prediction. The presented theoretical results are consistent with those obtained for other carbides, in particular with titanium carbide (TiC) [14], and with experimental findings. Nevertheless, more work is still needed to fully resolve the positive role of carbide precipitates on the improved resistance of steels to hydrogen embrittlement [2].

Acknowledgments

SER would like to thank Mohamed Sherif from SKF Research & Technology Development (RTD), SKF B.V., Houten, The Netherlands and Robin Chaudret from Scienomics, Paris, France for useful discussions. This work was supported in part through the computational resources and staff contributions provided for the Comlab high performance computing facility at SKF Research & Technology Development, Houten, The Netherlands.

MM gratefully acknowledges the financial support under the scope of the COMET program within the K2 Center

Integrated Computational Material, Process and Product Engineering (IC-MPPE) (Project No 859480). This program is supported by the Austrian Federal Ministries for Transport, Innovation and Technology (BMVIT) and for Digital and Economic Affairs (BMDW), represented by the Austrian research funding association (FFG), and the federal states of Styria, Upper Austria and Tyrol.

ATP is supported by EPSRC under the HEmS Programme Grant EP/L014742.

The present results have been obtained through the use of the ABINIT code, a common project of the Université Catholique de Louvain, Corning Incorporated, and other contributors. The images were generated using the software V_Sim (http://inac.cea.fr/L_Sim/V_Sim/).

- [1] H. Bhadeshia, Progress in Materials Science 57 (2012) 268–435. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pmatsci.2011.06.002><http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0079642511000922>. doi:10.1016/j.pmatsci.2011.06.002.
- [2] B. Szost, R. Vegter, P. Rivera-Díaz-del Castillo, Materials & Design 43 (2013) 499–506. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0261306912004827>. doi:10.1016/j.matdes.2012.07.030.
- [3] M.-H. Evans, A. Richardson, L. Wang, R. Wood, Wear 306 (2013) 226–241. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wear.2013.03.008><http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0043164813001877>. doi:10.1016/j.wear.2013.03.008.
- [4] R. H. Vegter, J. T. Slycke, J. Beswick, S. W. Dean, Journal of ASTM International 7 (2010) 102543. URL: <http://www.astm.org/doiLink.cgi?JAI102543>. doi:10.1520/JAI102543.
- [5] P. Sofronis, in: AIP Conference Proceedings, volume 837, AIP, 2006, pp. 64–70. URL: <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/proceeding/aipcp/10.1063/1.2213060>. doi:10.1063/1.2213060.
- [6] B. Szost, P. Rivera-Díaz-del Castillo, Scripta Materialia 68 (2013) 467–470. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1359646212007385>. doi:10.1016/j.scriptamat.2012.11.018.
- [7] H. Birnbaum, P. Sofronis, Materials Science and Engineering: A 176 (1994) 191–202. doi:10.1016/0921-5093(94)90975-X.
- [8] B. A. Szost, R. H. Vegter, P. E. J. Rivera-Díaz-del Castillo, Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A 44 (2013) 4542–4550. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11661-013-1795-7>. doi:10.1007/s11661-013-1795-7.
- [9] P. Hohenberg, W. Kohn, Physical Review 136 (1964) B864–B871. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.136.B864>. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.136.B864.
- [10] W. Kohn, L. J. Sham, Physical Review 140 (1965) A1133–A1138. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.140.A1133>. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.140.A1133.
- [11] J. Takahashi, K. Kawakami, T. Tarui, Scripta Materialia 67 (2012) 213–216. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1359646212002631>. doi:10.1016/j.scriptamat.2012.04.022.
- [12] Y.-S. Chen, D. Haley, S. S. A. Gerstl, A. J. London, F. Sweeney, R. A. Wepf, W. M. Rainforth, P. A. J. Bagot, M. P. Moody, Science 355 (2017) 1196–1199. URL: <http://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aal2418>. doi:10.1126/science.aal2418.
- [13] J. Takahashi, K. Kawakami, Y. Kobayashi, Acta Materialia 153 (2018) 193–204. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2018.05.003><https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1359645418303549>. doi:10.1016/j.actamat.2018.05.003.
- [14] D. Di Stefano, R. Nazarov, T. Hickel, J. Neugebauer, M. Mrovec, C. Elsässer, Physical Review B 93 (2016) 184108. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.184108>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.93.184108.
- [15] X. Gonze, B. Amadon, P. M. Anglade, J. M. Beuken, F. Bottin, P. Boulanger, F. Bruneval, D. Caliste, R. Caracas, M. Côté, T. Deutsch, L. Genovese, P. Ghosez, M. Giantomassi, S. Goedecker, D. R. Hamann, P. Hermet, F. Jollet, G. Jomard, S. Leroux, M. Mancini, S. Mazevet, M. J. T. Oliveira, G. Onida, Y. Pouillon, T. Rangel, G. M. Rignanese, D. Sangalli, R. Shaltaf, M. Torrent, M. J. Verstraete, G. Zerah, J. W. Zwanziger, Computer Physics Communications 180 (2009) 2582–2615. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2009.07.007>. doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2009.07.007.
- [16] A. D. Becke, Physical Review A 38 (1988) 3098–3100. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.38.3098>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.38.3098. arXiv:PhysRevA.38.3098.
- [17] D. C. Langreth, M. J. Mehl, Physical Review B 28 (1983) 1809–1834. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.28.1809.
- [18] J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh, C. Fiolhais, Physical Review B 46 (1992) 6671–6687. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.46.6671>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.46.6671.
- [19] J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh, C. Fiolhais, Physical Review B 48 (1993) 4978–4978. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.48.4978>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.48.4978.2.
- [20] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, Physical Review Letters 77 (1996) 3865–3868. URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10062328>{%}5Cnhttp://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865{%}5Cnhttp://link.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v77/p3865https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865.
- [21] M. Torrent, F. Jollet, F. Bottin, G. Zerah, X. Gonze, Computational Materials Science 42 (2008) 337–351. doi:10.1016/j.commatsci.2007.07.020.
- [22] P. E. Blöchl, Physical Review B 50 (1994) 17953–17979. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.50.17953>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.50.17953.
- [23] K. F. Garrity, J. W. Bennett, K. M. Rabe, D. Vanderbilt, Computational Materials Science 81 (2014) 446–452. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0927025613005077>. doi:10.1016/j.commatsci.2013.08.053.
- [24] W. Kolos, C. C. J. Roothaan, Reviews of Modern Physics 32 (1960) 219–232. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.32.219>. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.32.219.
- [25] Y. Liu, S. Huang, J. Ding, Y. Yang, J. Zhao, International Journal of Hydrogen Energy 44 (2019) 6093–6102. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.01.049><https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0360319919301235>. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.01.049.
- [26] A. Srivastava, M. Chauhan, R. Singh, Phase Transitions 84 (2011) 58–66. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01411594.2010.509644>. doi:10.1080/01411594.2010.509644.
- [27] A.-M. Hao, T.-J. Zhou, Y. Zhu, X.-Y. Zhang, R.-P. Liu, Chinese Physics B 20 (2011) 047103. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1674-1056/20/i=4/a=047103?key=crossref.cfbf50bcffeb32f8556cf4f4184aac0>. doi:10.1088/1674-1056/20/4/047103.
- [28] K. Nakamura, M. Yashima, Materials Science and Engineering: B 148 (2008) 69–72. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S092151070700503X>. doi:10.1016/j.mseb.2007.09.040.
- [29] V. Zhukov, V. Gubanov, Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids 48 (1987) 187–195. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0022369787900837>. doi:10.1016/0022-3697(87)90083-7.
- [30] A. Vojvodic, C. Ruberto, Journal of physics. Condensed matter : an Institute of Physics journal 22 (2010) 375501. URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21403197>. doi:10.1088/0953-8984/22/37/375501.
- [31] Z. Sun, R. Ahuja, J. Lowther, Solid State Communications 150 (2010) 697–700. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0038109810000803>.

- doi:10.1016/j.ssc.2010.01.043.
- [32] H. Liu, J. Zhu, Y. Liu, Z. Lai, *Materials Letters* 62 (2008) 3084–3086. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167577X08001602>. doi:10.1016/j.matlet.2008.01.136.
 - [33] W. Wolf, R. Podlucky, T. Antretter, F. Philosophical Magazine B 79 (1999) 839–858. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13642819908214844><http://journalsonline.tandf.co.uk/Index/10.1080/014186399256943>. doi:10.1080/014186399256943.
 - [34] F. Tran, R. Laskowski, P. Blaha, K. Schwarz, *Physical Review B - Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* 75 (2007) 1–14. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.75.115131.
 - [35] L. Q. Zhang, Y. Cheng, Z. W. Niu, *Journal of Atomic and Molecular Sciences* 5 (2014) 81–94. URL: <http://www.global-sci.org/jams/volumes/v5n1/pdf/051-81.pdf>. doi:10.4208/jams.072513.101413a.
 - [36] M. W. Finnis, J. E. Sinclair, *Philosophical Magazine A* 50 (1984) 45–55. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01418618408244210>. doi:10.1080/01418618408244210.
 - [37] L. Koči, Y. Ma, A. R. Oganov, P. Souvatzis, R. Ahuja, *Physical Review B* 77 (2008) 214101. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.77.214101>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.77.214101.
 - [38] M. Hasegawa, K. Nishidate, *Physical Review B* 70 (2004) 205431. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.70.205431>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.70.205431.
 - [39] H. Rydberg, N. Jacobson, P. Hyldgaard, S. Simak, B. Lundqvist, D. Langreth, *Surface Science* 532–535 (2003) 606–610. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0039602803001092>. doi:10.1016/S0039-6028(03)00109-2.
 - [40] Y. Baskin, L. Meyer, *Physical Review* 100 (1955) 544–544. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.100.544>. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.100.544.
 - [41] P. Haas, F. Tran, P. Blaha, *Physical Review B - Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* 79 (2009) 1–10. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.79.085104.
 - [42] D. H. R. Fors, G. Wahnström, *Physical Review B* 82 (2010) 195410. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.82.195410>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.82.195410.
 - [43] A. Hung, I. Yarovsky, J. Muscat, S. Russo, I. Snook, R. Watts, *Surface Science* 501 (2002) 261–269. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0039602801017629>. doi:10.1016/S0039-6028(01)01762-9.
 - [44] W. P. Davey, *Physical Review* 25 (1925) 753–761. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.25.753.
 - [45] N. Ridley, H. Stuart, *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* 1 (2002) 1291–1295. doi:10.1088/0022-3727/1/10/308.
 - [46] J. H. Jang, C. H. Lee, Y. U. Heo, D. W. Suh, *Acta Materialia* 60 (2012) 208–217. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2011.09.051>. doi:10.1016/j.actamat.2011.09.051.
 - [47] T. Epicier, D. Acevedo, M. Perez, *Philosophical Magazine* 88 (2008) 31–45. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14786430701753816>. doi:10.1080/14786430701753816.
 - [48] F.-G. Wei, T. Hara, K. Tsuzaki, in: *Advanced Steels*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 87–92. URL: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-17665-4_11. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-17665-4_11.
 - [49] V. Randle, *The measurement of grain boundary geometry*, Electron microscopy in materials science series, Institute of Physics, 1993. URL: <http://books.google.nl/books?id=mgprQgAACAAJ>.
 - [50] S. Echeverri Restrepo, S. Tamayo Giraldo, B. J. Thijssen, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* 21 (2013) 055017. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0965-0393/21/i=5/a=055017?key=crossref.060fedf363c00b209f02970a28b12955>. doi:10.1088/0965-0393/21/5/055017.
 - [51] S. Echeverri Restrepo, B. J. Thijssen, *MRS Proceedings* 1224 (2011) 1224–GG05–03. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1557/PROC-1224-GG05-03>http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract/_S1946427400019849http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract/_S1946427400019849. doi:10.1557/PROC-1224-GG05-03.
 - [52] K. Kawakami, T. Matsumiya, *ISIJ International* 52 (2012) 1693–1697. URL: <http://jlc.jst.go.jp/DN/JST.JSTAGE/isijinternational/52.1693?lang=en&from=CrossRef&type=abstract>. doi:10.2355/isijinternational.52.1693.
 - [53] N.-Y. Park, J.-H. Choi, P.-R. Cha, W.-S. Jung, S.-H. Chung, S.-C. Lee, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* 117 (2013) 187–193. URL: <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/jp306859n>. doi:10.1021/jp306859n.
 - [54] S.-H. Chung, H.-P. Ha, W.-S. Jung, J.-Y. Byun, *ISIJ International* 46 (2006) 1523–1531. URL: <http://joi.jlc.jst.go.jp/JST.JSTAGE/isijinternational/46.1523?from=CrossRef>. doi:10.2355/isijinternational.46.1523.
 - [55] D. J. Siegel, L. G. Hector, J. B. Adams, *Acta Materialia* 50 (2002) 619–631. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1359645401003615>. doi:10.1016/S1359-6454(01)00361-5.
 - [56] C. K. Ande, M. H. F. Sluiter, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 43 (2012) 4436–4444. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11661-012-1229-y>. doi:10.1007/s11661-012-1229-y.
 - [57] X. Chong, Y. Jiang, R. Zhou, J. Feng, *RSC Adv.* 4 (2014) 44959–44971. URL: <http://xlink.rsc.org/?DOI=C4RA07543A>. doi:10.1039/C4RA07543A.
 - [58] V. Ozoliš, J. Häglund, *Physical Review B* 48 (1993) 5069–5076. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.48.5069>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.48.5069.
 - [59] K. R. Limmer, *First-principles investigations of iron-based alloys and their properties*, Ph.D. thesis, Missouri University of Science and Technology, 2014. URL: http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/doctoral/_dissertations/2347.
 - [60] B. Wang, Y. Liu, J. Ye, *Physica Scripta* 88 (2013) 015301. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1402-4896/88/i=1/a=015301?key=crossref.b126b0c89b1d6df7344e4b34e339d659>. doi:10.1088/0031-8949/88/01/015301.
 - [61] J. W. Wang, H. Gong, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 39 (2014) 6068–6075. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2014.01.126><https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0360319914002067>. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2014.01.126.
 - [62] M. Marlo, V. Milman, *Physical Review B* 62 (2000) 2899–2907. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.62.2899>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.62.2899.
 - [63] M. J. S. Spencer, A. Hung, I. K. Snook, I. Yarovsky, *Surface Science* 513 (2002) 389–398. doi:10.1016/S0039-6028(02)01809-5.
 - [64] P. Błoński, A. Kiejna, *Vacuum* 74 (2004) 179–183. URL: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0042207X04000132>. doi:10.1016/j.vacuum.2003.12.118.
 - [65] Y. A. Du, L. Ismer, J. Rogal, T. Hickel, J. Neugebauer, R. Drautz, *Physical Review B* 84 (2011) 144121. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.84.144121>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.84.144121.
 - [66] D. E. Jiang, E. A. Carter, *Physical Review B* 70 (2004) 064102. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.70.064102>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.70.064102.
 - [67] J. P. Hirth, *Metallurgical Transactions A* 11 (1980) 861–890. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF02654700>. doi:10.1007/BF02654700.
 - [68] J. Nguyen, N. Glandut, C. Jaoul, P. Lefort, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 40 (2015) 8562–8570. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0360319915011271>. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.05.009.
 - [69] E. J. Song, H. Bhadeshia, D.-W. Suh, *Corrosion Science* 77 (2013) 379–384. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.corsci.2013.07.043><https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0010938X13003533>. doi:10.1016/j.corsci.2013.07.043.
 - [70] A. Ramasubramaniam, M. Itakura, M. Ortiz, E. Carter, *Journal of Materials Research* 23 (2008) 2757–2773. URL: http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract/_S0884291400030259. doi:10.1016/j.jmr.2008.07.043.

doi:10.1557/JMR.2008.0340.

- [71] K. Miwa, A. Fukumoto, Physical Review B 65 (2002) 155114. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.65.155114>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.65.155114.
- [72] R. Kirchheim, Scripta Materialia 160 (2019) 62–65. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scriptamat.2018.09.043><https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1359646218305943>. doi:10.1016/j.scriptamat.2018.09.043.
- [73] D. Di Stefano, M. Mrovec, C. Elsässer, Physical Review B 92 (2015) 224301. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.92.224301>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.92.224301.
- [74] A. Y. Lozovoi, A. T. Paxton, M. W. Finnis, Physical Review B 74 (2006) 155416. URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.74.155416>. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.74.155416. arXiv:0608508.
- [75] M. W. Finnis, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter 8 (1996) 5811–5836. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/8/i=32/a=003?key=crossref.6b2d897a5a15cc01a9a7a0826bfa6dab>. doi:10.1088/0953-8984/8/32/003.
- [76] L. M. Liu, S. Q. Wang, H. Q. Ye, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter 17 (2005) 5335–5348. URL: <http://iopscience.iop.org/0953-8984/17/35/002>. doi:10.1088/0953-8984/17/35/002.